REMARKS

Claims 9-21 and 24-25 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of September 9, 2005, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims are said to contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Support for claims 9-21 (claims 9 and 10 as amended) can be found in the specification as filed at page 6, lines 22-33, as follows:

> If the steel sheet is [electric] electrolytically plated in a plating bather mainly including zinc in which water soluble salts of cobalt, nickel, and/or molybdenum are also [comprised] included, [it]one can [be obtained] obtain a galvanized alloy plating layer 10 in which cobalt, nickel and/or molybdenum is deposited or dispersed.
>
> The galvanized alloy steel sheet is electrolyzed anodically in a bath of which the component is as same as that in the plating bath. By forming a layer of which the composite mainly includes at least one kind of hydrate oxide selected from a group of Zn, Co, Ni and Mo on a surface of the galvanized alloy plating steel plate, a surface of the steel sheet becomes dark blue-blacked or blacked so as to form the colored layer 2.

Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to clarify the process for producing a galvanized alloy steel sheet. That is, a steel sheet is treated anodically in solution, the solution containing metal ions such that hydrate oxides selected from the group consisting of Zn, Co, Ni and Mo are formed on the steel sheet to forma galvanized steel sheet.

Art Rejections

Claims 9-12 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saitou et al.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The galvanized alloy layer on the steel sheet of the present invention is formed by anodically treating the steel sheet in

a plating bath. In contrast thereto, the sheet of Saitou is produced by electrolyzing a steel sheet at a cathode. This is the opposite of what is claimed in the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that the coating of the present invention differs from that of Saitou et al. in that the coating of the present invention is not subjected to a chromate treatment. In the present invention, a chromate treatment is specifically contraindicated. The specification as filed at page 7, lines 16-23, states that there is a danger that chromate treatment may deteriorate the ornamental effect. Saitou et al., on the other hand, specifically disclose applying a chromate treatment (column 6, lines 6-9). Thus it is clear that the coating of the present invention is different from that of Saitou et al. because of the lack of chromate treatment, which in the present case would deteriorate the ornamental effect of the coating. This is not the case with Saitou et al.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saitou et al. in view of Smith et al.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. As noted above, the galvanized alloy steel sheet of the present invention is formed by anodically treating the steel sheet in a plating bath, while the sheet of Saitou et al. is formed by

cathodically treating the steel sheet in a plating bath. Smith et al. merely disclose a polyurethane dispersion that can be used to coat cold rolled steel plates having the pencil hardness, tensile strength and extension ratio limitations of claims 13 and 14. Since claims 13 and 14 have the limitations of claims 9 and 10 of anodically treating the steel sheet, it is respectfully submitted that Smith et al. adds nothing to Saitou et al. to lead one skilled in the art to produce a galvanized alloy steel sheet anodically rather than cathodically. As noted above, the coating of the present invention differs from Saitou et al. in not requiring, in fact, advising against, a chromate treatment.

Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizaka et al. in view of Saitou et al.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner concedes that Ishizaka et al. do not teach that the steel film cartridges have the herein claimed galvanized alloy plating, blackened surface, or a resin coating. However, Saitou et al. add nothing to Ishizaka et al., as Saitou et al. produce the anodically coated steel sheet by a process entirely different from that of the present invention, which produces a different type of coating from that of Saitou et al.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: _____
Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\T\TOYO\Komai4\PTO\AMD 02 DEC 05.doc